

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

|                           |   |                             |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| ROBERT R. DYER,           | ) |                             |
|                           | ) |                             |
| Plaintiff,                | ) |                             |
|                           | ) |                             |
| v.                        | ) | Docket No. 2:24-cv-00353-NT |
|                           | ) |                             |
| KAMALA D. HARRIS, et al., | ) |                             |
|                           | ) |                             |
| Defendants.               | ) |                             |

**ORDER AFFIRMING THE RECOMMENDED DECISIONS  
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On November 4, 2024, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court, with copies to the parties, his Recommended Decision (ECF No. 10), recommending that the Court dismiss the Plaintiff's Complaint for Constitutional Determinations for the Disqualification of a Foreign Citizenship Holder on the 2024 Federal Election Ballot (ECF No. 1).<sup>1</sup> On November 15, 2024, the Plaintiff filed a corrected Complaint (ECF No. 12), and on November 18, 2024, the Plaintiff filed an updated Complaint (ECF No. 13).<sup>2</sup>

On November 19, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued, with copies to the parties, a Supplemental Recommended Decision (ECF No. 14). The Plaintiff filed an objection to the two Recommended Decisions on November 25, 2024 (ECF No. 19).<sup>3</sup> I have

---

<sup>1</sup> At the same time, the Magistrate Judge entered an order (ECF Nos. 10–11) denying the Plaintiff's Motion for Issuance of Summons for the Complaint by the Clerk of the Court (ECF No. 7).

<sup>2</sup> The Plaintiff also filed a motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 15) of the Magistrate Judge's November 4, 2024 Recommended Decision (ECF No. 10). The Magistrate Judge issued a written order denying the Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 16) on November 20, 2024.

<sup>3</sup> The Plaintiff also seeks *de novo* review of the Magistrate Judge's November 4, 2024 order

reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision and the Supplemental Recommended Decision, together with the entire record, and I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decisions. I concur with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons he stated and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's objection is **OVERRULED** and that the Recommended Decisions of the Magistrate Judge are hereby **ADOPTED**. It is further **ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Nancy Torresen  
United States District Judge

Dated this 10th day of December, 2024.

---

denying the Plaintiff's request for the issuance of summonses. The Magistrate Judge notified the Plaintiff that any objections to the order on the motion for summonses must be filed in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, which states that "[a] party may serve and file objections" to an order on a nondispositive pretrial matter "within 14 days after being served with a copy." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). Even if I were to consider the Plaintiff's November 25, 2024 objection to the November 4, 2024 order as timely, the Magistrate Judge's order is neither "clearly erroneous" nor "contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). Accordingly, I **DENY** the Plaintiff's request to modify or set aside the Magistrate Judge's order on the Plaintiff's motion for summonses.